

FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN

An analysis of current international events



Univ. of the South
The Library
Sewanee, Tenn.

1918-1951

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION • INCORPORATED • 22 EAST 38TH STREET • NEW YORK 16, N. Y.

VOL. XXX No. 24

MARCH 23, 1951

Senator Smith Urges Sanctions Against Peiping

The present world conflict is far more than a mere struggle for power between two opposing forces. Fundamentally it is a struggle between human freedom and human slavery. I shall discuss separately the main problems facing us today in the North Atlantic and in the Far East.

A. The North Atlantic

The intensified threat of communism against Western Europe, an area of inestimable value for the defense of our own freedom, forces the North Atlantic countries to stand together and mobilize together, more rapidly and on a more massive scale than was first anticipated. I believe there is no sound alternative.

In addition to naval and air power and urgently needed arms and equipment, I believe we should send a contingent of ground forces to Europe. This will be a powerful factor in promoting collective morale and confidence in Atlantic defense. The proposed contribution of six American divisions seems to be reasonable. Barring full-scale war, I think our troop contribution should taper off as the mobilization effort of our Atlantic allies gathers momentum. At all events it must remain within the limits of our national resources and responsibilities.

This proposed ground defense of Europe is one essential part of our total military strategy. The basis of that strategy must be to deter Russian aggression by building our own strength to the point where aggression would be too costly—and thus to keep the peace. In addition to ground defense in Europe this requires the power of overwhelming strategic retaliation, primar-

ily through our air force, and a high degree of mobility by means of sea power and key bases around the Soviet perimeter.

This is the basic pattern of strategic defense, not simply for the United States but

As its contribution to the "great debate," the Foreign Policy Association has invited distinguished leaders of differing opinions to present their views on the course the United States should follow in world affairs. The ninth article in the series appears in the adjoining columns.

for the whole free world. Its success should bring us to a point where fruitful negotiation with the Soviets will be possible.

America cannot dominate this effort, but America must show leadership. This will be possible only if the American people are united in their understanding and support of this costly program. To that end I believe the Executive, irrespective of the question of his constitutional authority to act alone, must collaborate fully and continuously with Congress in the development of policy under the North Atlantic treaty.

B. The Far East

In Asia the United Nations has been slow and hesitant in facing up to the issue in Korea. Having at last agreed that Communist China is an aggressor, it should now impose effective sanctions until the aggression is abandoned. To reinforce the sanction of continued armed resistance in

Korea itself, we should urge the UN to explore the possibility of economic boycott against Communist China, the bombing of military targets in Manchuria, and withdrawal of recognition by those nations which have recognized Peiping.

We must also continue defending Formosa against attack, both for its military value and because it is the seat of the recognized government of China and the home of 7 million Formosans who deserve protection against conquest. To this end we must aid Formosa as quickly as possible to defend itself with full and adequate equipment supplied by us.

As an added sanction against aggression the anti-Communist forces in China should be aided and encouraged, both by us and by the Nationalists on Formosa, to organize a powerful underground resistance.

Considering the military security of the whole Far Eastern area, we find the line of primary United States responsibility running through Japan, Okinawa, Formosa and the Philippines. The free nations, acting together, should extend this line to cover the areas from Indo-China to India. In connection with the Japanese peace treaty the United States has recently been discussing a possible mutual defense pact with Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines and Japan. I would favor such a pact, and I would favor a joint declaration with these and other Pacific nations that any further aggression in that area would be regarded as a menace to world peace and security—in other words, a collective Monroe Doctrine for the Asiatic area. In addition, we should give material aid to the exposed nations of Asia to build

Contents of this BULLETIN may be reproduced with credit to the Foreign Policy Association

their own defense. None of these steps should involve any proposal to commit American troops on the Asiatic mainland.

Military security in Asia cannot be attained without social and economic progress. The real Asian revolution is motivated not by communism but by hunger, poverty, disease and foreign domination. We should therefore give effective aid through technical assistance and investment to help the Asiatic peoples work out their own salvation. Our efforts should be closely coordinated with the work of the United Nations and with the constructive plans already developed by the British

Commonwealth. Only by such means can we insure that the Asian peoples will have a real stake in the defense and development of human freedom.

C. The Battle for the Minds of Men

No military or economic policies can succeed unless we convince the peoples of the world, by our actions and our words, that the issue at stake is not a mere power struggle but a fundamental struggle between freedom and slavery. In Asia especially we must also present the cause of freedom in a way which has vital meaning

in the lives of people seeking relief from hunger, poverty, disease, ignorance and foreign domination. This is the greatest challenge to America. Not alone, as if we were the sole champions of freedom, but in concert with all freedom-loving and freedom-seeking peoples, we must bring to bear the power of the idea of human freedom for the peaceful liberation of mankind.

H. ALEXANDER SMITH

(Senator Smith, Republican of New Jersey, is member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. A former member of the Board of Directors of the Foreign Policy Association, he is now an honorary member of that Board.)

U.S. Policy Strengthened Despite Congressional Curbs

WASHINGTON—The slowness of the Senate in deciding whether to give the President a free hand to send troops wherever he wishes in whatever number seems desirable has deflated the hopes of the Truman Administration that the obviously growing strength of the United States might induce the Soviet representatives at the Paris conference of deputies to conciliate the West.

Senator Robert A. Taft, Republican of Ohio, raised the issue of presidential power in January, and soon afterwards Senator Kenneth S. Wherry, Republican of Nebraska, introduced a resolution designed to subject the President to the control of Congress so far as the peacetime use of troops abroad is concerned. In mid-February the Senate Foreign Relations Committee opened hearings on the issue. Another month passed before the debate began in the Senate, and the wording of the Senate resolution has left the question of that body's conception of the President's powers so much up in the air that the amount of strength the United States can manifest abroad remains uncertain.

Troop Question Confused

The confusion abroad about American intentions which results from this delay reflects confusion among the Senators themselves. The Foreign Relations Committee, for example, instead of making a clear-cut decision, wrapped the issue in two layers of fog before passing the matter on to the Senate as a whole.

The committee has recommended two resolutions to the Senate instead of one: the first, a simple resolution, expressing the sense of the Senate; the second, a concurrent resolution, calling for an expression of opinion from the House of Representa-

tives. The invitation to the House was an invitation to further delay.

The committee, also, although ostensibly rebuffing the Taft-Wherry point of view, worded its simple resolution in a way reminiscent of Senator Wherry's, which read:

"Resolved, that it is the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area for the purpose of the North Atlantic treaty pending the formulation of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress."

Article 6 of the simple resolution approved by the Foreign Relations Committee said:

"It is the sense of the Senate that, in the interests of sound constitutional processes and of national unity and understanding, congressional approval should be obtained of any policy requiring the assignment of American troops abroad when such assignment is in implementation of Article III of the North Atlantic treaty; and the Senate hereby approves the present plans of the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to send four additional divisions of ground forces to Western Europe."

The Wherry resolution implied that Congress had responsibility for making the policy about troops. The approved resolution leaves policy-making to the President but implies that the Senate (or Congress) is to pass on (and may reject) the policy. What further confounds the confusion is the doubt of many Senators that the resolution as written has any real meaning. "The Senate resolution has no legal or binding effect," Senator Alexander Wiley, Republican of Wisconsin, ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee, told his colleagues on March 16.

Senator Wiley failed in an attempt to persuade the committee to adopt a *joint* resolution, subject to approval by Senate and House and in need of the signature of the President to be effective. Such an instrument would have involved Mr. Truman in the Congress' expression of its opinion about his powers. In the absence of such an instrument, Mr. Wiley said, "We are on shadowy ground." Legally the President need not heed Congress' mere opinion about the extent of his authority. Nevertheless, the outcome of the controversy to date has had a substantial political effect by making the Administration hesitate about following its own logic in planning the re-enforcement of Western Europe and by demonstrating to the Soviet Union as well as to our allies that influential Americans are still divided about means to implement our role in world affairs.

Paris Conference

Yet, since the American show of confusion affects only implementation and does not reflect dissatisfaction with the policy itself of encouraging Western Europe to remain free of Soviet influence, events in the Senate have not seriously shaken American-British-French solidarity at the Paris conference of Big Four foreign ministers' deputies. These developments, however, have not prompted the Russian deputy, Andrei A. Gromyko, to seek agreement at the cost of abandoning policy proposals which Moscow apparently considers essential.

The meeting in the Palais Rose has been marked during the past ten days by occasional hints of concessions by each side, but so far the hints have not materialized into concrete agreement. One basic divergence arises from the Russian view that

German armaments, German unification and a German peace treaty should be considered as a unit apart from other issues, and the Western position that the issue of German armaments is inseparable from that of armaments in Eastern Europe.

On March 15 Dr. Philip C. Jessup, the American representative at the Palais Rose, conceded that the question of German armaments and demilitarization should be included and discussed by the American, Soviet, British and French foreign ministers, if they should meet. But while the United States has thereby acknowledged that the arming of Germany might be unsettling to world stability, the Kremlin has not similarly acknowledged that the arming of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary and Rumania is also unsettling and, moreover, as far as the former Axis satellites are concerned, represents a violation of the peace treaties.

While the conference remains deadlocked, the strength of the West in Europe continues to wax, despite the dilly-dallying in the Senate. A sore spot in intra-Western relations was alleviated last week when Italian Prime Minister Alcide de Gasperi visited Britain, where he conversed with Prime Minister Attlee and the new foreign secretary, Herbert Morrison, who had just succeeded the ailing Ernest Bevin. Postwar relations between the two countries had been deteriorating, but de Gasperi left with hope that a better understanding is in prospect. The meeting made clear the

continuing British opposition to arrangements that would strengthen Russia in the Mediterranean area. The British assured de Gasperi that Britain stood behind the 1948 agreement on Trieste, which proposes a settlement favorable to Italian interests.

While this promise can scarcely insure that Italy will obtain the kind of final arrangement for Trieste that it wants, in view of Yugoslavia's conflicting claims, London's assurance does mean that Moscow will not, at least in the current period of mistrust and rivalry, have its way on Trieste. His visit to London, however, failed to improve de Gasperi's political position at home, where he heads an uneasy and fluid coalition, but it did bolster the effort of the United States to invigorate the North Atlantic alliance.

Point Four and Strength

Dilution of the emphasis on military strength that now pervades United States foreign policy was suggested on March 11 by the International Development Board, which President Truman on November 24 directed to recommend an expanded Point Four program for development of backward areas. The program now subsists on a year's appropriation of \$35 million. The Development Advisory Board, headed by Nelson A. Rockefeller, suggested an expenditure of \$4.5 billion, to be drawn from public and private sources, all to be spent under the supervision of a new agency which would be called the

Overseas Economic Administration.

The Board's report contains no arguments for Point Four different from those which have hitherto failed to convince Congress of the need for a major policy of foreign development, except in its appeal at one point to the country's present interest in military expansion. The Board recommended "an investment of \$2 billion in production facilities in the next few years [to] swell the flow of critical materials to this country and to Europe by \$1 billion a year," because "an immediate step-up in the production of key minerals is vital if we are to be able to meet the growing demands of military production."

Such an attitude in the management of Point Four could alienate the inhabitants of underdeveloped areas, who in Asia and in many parts of Africa, at least, already have doubts about American motives. It could also lead to disappointment for the United States because studies made under the auspices of the Economic Cooperation Administration have shown that the development of mineral production in the nonindustrialized areas promises to be a slow process, for a variety of geological, transportation, manpower, economic and political reasons. Although the report ignores many international realities, it marks a step forward in the search for non-military forms of strength which would make a more lasting foundation for Western and world stability than the mere display of arms. BLAIR BOLLES

FPA Bookshelf

RECENT BOOKS ON BRITAIN AND THE COMMONWEALTH

British Politics Since 1900, by D. C. Somervell. New York, Oxford, 1950. \$3.75.

A British historian charts the swings of the political pendulum in the past century—a significant and lively period treated in a lively fashion. It is a long span from Lord Rosebery and the Webbs to Clement Attlee and Aneurin Bevan, but the author covers it well by confining himself to elections, campaigning and the issues on which they are based.

Crisis in Britain: Plans and Achievements of the Labour Government, by Robert A. Brady. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1950. \$5.

In a careful, documented assessment, Professor Brady finds Labor's record as one of partial successes offset by partial failures. He believes Britain needs a "revolutionary replanning of all the factors bearing on the problems of improving British productive methods . . . at home . . . and a drastic reorientation of both colonial and foreign policy . . . abroad." He states that the blame for not meeting Britain's crisis adequately lies not with the Labor party alone but with the country as a whole.

The Cautious Revolution: Britain Today and Tomorrow, by Ernest Watkins. New York, Farrar Straus, 1950. \$5.

A broad, general and human survey of Labor Britain by a thoughtful Englishman who sets out to answer a host of American questions. The author provides both facts and opinion on such issues as nationalization of coal, rationing, the Commonwealth, British attitudes toward Hollywood, Palestine, Germany and Russia.

The British Overseas: Exploits of a Nation of Shopkeepers, by C. E. Carrington. New York, Cambridge University Press, 1950. \$9.

This omnibus volume of nearly 1,100 pages attempts, with considerable success, to sum up the growth of the British Empire and its development into the present-day Commonwealth. The author concentrates not on what happened in London but on what happened overseas, hopping nimbly from the Yukon to the Maori wars in New Zealand, from General Kruger in South Africa to Nehru in India. Well-organized and well-written, a useful reference book, which also makes gratifying reading.

Changing Empire: Churchill to Nehru, by Eric Estorick. New York, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1950. \$3.75.

A journalistic account of recent changes in the Commonwealth, presented largely through bio-

graphical portraits of Churchill, MacKenzie King, Smuts, Attlee, Bevin, Nehru and Evatt.

RECENT BOOKS ON ASIA

South Asia in the World Today, edited by Phillips Talbot. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1950. \$4.00.

J. S. Furnivall, Cora Du Bois, John F. Embree, Karl J. Pelzer, Daniel Thorner, Harold R. Isaacs and William L. Holland were among the participants at the Harris Foundation Institute of May 1949 whose lectures are brought together in this volume. Considerable attention is given to social and economic forces in South Asia, while concluding sections deal with political problems and American policy and interests.

Notes on Labor Problems in Nationalist China, by Israel Epstein. 1949. \$2.25.

Frontier Land Systems in Southernmost China, by Chen Han-seng. 1949. \$2.00.

Notes on Educational Problems in Communist China, by Michael Lindsay. 1950. \$2.50.

Japan's Textile Industry, by John R. Stewart. 1949. \$1.25.

Three Reports on the Malayan Problem, by David R. Rees-Williams, Tan Chen Lock, S. S. Awbery and F. W. Dalley. 1949. \$0.50.

The foregoing monographs, published by the International Secretariat, Institute of Pacific Re-

lations in New York, provide in accessible form useful background studies of some contemporary Asian problems.

The Government and Politics of China, by Ch'ien Tuan-sheng. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1950. (Published under the auspices of the International Secretariat, Institute of Pacific Relations.) \$7.50.

All who wish to understand the dynamics of the process by which the Chinese Communists came to power and the problems which they now face can do no better than to read this exhaustive treatise by one of China's outstanding political scientists, written while he was a visiting lecturer at Harvard in 1948. He devotes the bulk of his volume to the political ideas, governmental system and political rivalries of the Kuomintang, demonstrating the weaknesses which led to final collapse and the underlying realities which must be dealt with by any government of China.

The Man of Independence, by Jonathan Daniels. Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1950. \$3.75.

Few men have such vast powers with such far-reaching possibilities for good or ill in world affairs as the President of the United States. Yet few men of comparable importance are so little known as is President Harry S. Truman. Mr. Daniels, editor, author and politician, has given us a full-length portrait of the nation's first citizen.

Roosevelt in Retrospect, A Profile in History, by John Gunther. New York, Harper, 1950. \$3.75.

A biographical study by a gifted American journalist, throwing some interesting sidelights on American foreign policy from the "quarantine" speech in 1937 to Yalta in 1945.

National Security and Individual Freedom, by Harold D. Lasswell. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1950. \$3.50.

This provocative book, issued as a research study by the Committee for Economic Development, examines the relationship between the need for increasing controls and stronger governmental authority during a period of struggle against totalitarianism abroad and the necessity to maintain civilian supremacy, freedom of information, civil liberties and a free economy at home as basic conditions of a democratic society.

Yearbook on Human Rights for 1948. Lake Success, N. Y., United Nations, 1950. \$6. (Sales No. 1950. XIV. 4)

The third volume of a series, this book contains the texts of new national laws—including electoral laws—enacted in 1948 affecting human rights, arranged by country; a compilation of treaties and agreements; and an account of United Nations activities in this field, with relevant documents.

Antisemitism in Modern France, Vol. I, *The Prologue to the Dreyfus Affair*, by Robert F. Byrnes. New Brunswick, N. J., Rutgers University Press, 1950. \$5.

The first volume—from 1870-1894—of a projected trilogy, this study by an American historian traces the economic, social, institutional and intellectual background of antisemitism in a modern democracy and points up its relationship to the emergence of totalitarianism in our times.

Branch and Affiliate Meetings

BOSTON, March 29, *Africa: Asset or Liability to the Atlantic Nations?* Samuel Ojo, Leonard Bruce Chwatt

DETROIT, March 29, *Objectives of American Foreign Policy*, Dean Rusk

EASTON, March 29, *Point Four*, Reeseman Fryer
SHREVEPORT, March 29, *Britain Today*, Colin Jackson, R. L. Lowndes

ST. LOUIS, March 29, *UNESCO in the Present Crisis*, Howard E. Wilson

CINCINNATI, March 30, 31, Fifth Annual World Affairs Institute, Hon. John Sherman Cooper, Benjamin Cohen, Nicolas Nyaradi

DETROIT, March 30, *Economic Foreign Policy*, Leroy Stinebower, *Western Europe*, John Bell, *Information Services Abroad*, M. R. T. Carter

DETROIT, March 31, *Far East*, Charlton Ogburn, Jr., *The Citizen and Foreign Policy*, M. R. T. Carter

LYNN, April 2, *The United States Invests in Democracy*, Howard C. Gary

PHILADELPHIA, April 3, *What Are the U.S. Stakes in Europe?* Johannes U. Hoeber, Marshall Dill, Jr.

DETROIT, April 4, *Where is Our Foreign Policy Leading Us in the Far East?* Robert E. Ward

BOSTON, April 5, *Can the Moral Forces of the World Unite?* Rev. Dana McLean Greeley, Rev. Theodore P. Theodoridis

DETROIT, April 5, *The World's Natural Resources and Population Pressures*, Stanley Cain

PHILADELPHIA, April 5, *Is There Any Chance for a Peaceful Settlement with Russia?* Robert Folwell, III

What Next in Iran?

What is behind the crisis in Iran? What do the Japanese think of the United States? How strong is the U.S.S.R.? For up-to-the-minute, carefully weighed answers to these questions, READ:

REFORM AND POWER POLITICS IN IRAN

by Georgiana G. Stevens

February 15 issue

POLITICS AND PUBLIC OPINION IN JAPAN

by Robert Scalapino

March 15 issue

THE U.S.S.R.—ECONOMIC STRENGTHS

AND WEAKNESSES

by Howard C. Gary

April 1 issue

Foreign Policy Report—25¢

Subscription \$5; to FPA members, \$4

Non-Self-Governing Territories. Lake Success, New York, United Nations, 1950. (Sales No. 1950. VI. B. 1.) 2 vols.

A wealth of information regarding social, economic, educational and, in some cases, political conditions in the world's dependent areas is contained in this third annual compilation summarizing the information transmitted to the Secretary General during 1949 under Chapter XI of the UN Charter. Also included is a general survey of the year and critical analyses of the information, prepared by the Secretariat.

News in the Making

IRANIAN OIL NATIONALIZED: The Iranian Majlis, reflecting strong popular sentiment, approved on March 15 a bill authorizing the government to nationalize the country's oil resources despite agreements which permitted British firms to operate and develop Iranian oil fields until 1993. *Pravda*, on March 18, charged that Premier Ali Razmara, an opponent of nationalization, had been assassinated by persons "closely connected" with American influence—a charge the State Department refused to dignify with a denial.

WHAT ROLE FOR SPAIN?: The general work stoppage in Barcelona on March 12, which appears to have had no specific leadership or objectives, reflected widespread and intense dissatisfaction with desperately low living standards. Meanwhile preliminary conversations have been conducted in Madrid regarding the possibility of a contribution by Spain to Western defense, with American assistance in providing weapons and parts at an estimated cost of perhaps \$300 million. European opinion, notably in France, questions the value to the democratic cause of any aid from the Franco government.

LA PRENSA AND HEMISPHERE RELATIONS: President Peron of Argentina used trade unions in his country to silence *La Prensa*, one of the two great independent Argentina newspapers. Peron's attack on *La Prensa* has created an unfavorable atmosphere for the Inter-American Conference scheduled to open in Washington on March 26.

ELECTIONS FOR AUSTRALIA: New elections will be held in Australia on April 28 at the request of the Liberal-Country party coalition cabinet headed by Prime Minister Robert G. Menzies. The government, which came to power in December 1949 after a long period of Labor party rule, has been challenged on several occasions by the Labor-dominated Senate. Moreover, a controversial law dissolving the Communist party and giving the government sweeping powers to remove Communists from public and trade union posts was invalidated by the Australian High Court on March 9.

FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN. Vol. XXX, No. 24, March 23, 1951. Published weekly from September through May inclusive and biweekly during June, July and August by the Foreign Policy Association, Incorporated. National Headquarters, 22 East 38th Street, New York 16, N. Y. BROOKS EMENY, President; VERA MICHELES DEAN, Editor; WILLIAM W. WADE, Associate Editor. The Foreign Policy Association contributes to public understanding by presenting a cross section of views on world affairs. The Association as an organization takes no position on international issues. Any opinions expressed in its publications are those of the authors. Re-entered as second-class matter June 4, 1948, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Four Dollars a Year. Please allow at least one month for change of address on membership publications.